

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Bruce Allen Buckner,)	C/A No.: 0:21-3874-TLW-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER AND NOTICE
York County Clerk of Court David)	
Hamilton,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Bruce Allen Buckner (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his constitutional rights by York County Clerk of Court David Hamilton (“Defendant”). Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civ. Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the district judge.

I. Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff alleges the York County Clerk of Court’s office “intentionally failed to send the Plaintiff copies of the Judgment Orders for 28 days so the Appellate Court would deny [his] appeal.” [ECF No. 1 at 3]. Plaintiff requests monetary damages.

II. Discussion

A. Standard of Review

Plaintiff filed his complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss a case upon a finding that the action fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted or is frivolous or malicious. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). A claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leake*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). A federal court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). In evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of N.Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). The mandated liberal construction afforded to pro se pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. Nevertheless,

the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts that set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 390–91 (4th Cir. 1990).

B. Analysis

Plaintiff's claims against Defendant arise from his office's alleged failure to timely mail Plaintiff the documents necessary for his appeal. [ECF No. 1 at 4]. It is well-settled that court support personnel have immunity from a claim for damages arising out of their judicial actions. *Chu v. Griffith*, 771 F.2d 79, 81 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Kincaid v. Vail*, 969 F.2d 594, 601 (7th Cir. 1992) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) (finding the doctrine of absolute quasi-judicial immunity has been adopted and made applicable to court support personnel because of “the danger that disappointed litigants, blocked by the doctrine of absolute immunity from suing the judge directly, will vent their wrath on clerks, court reporters, and other judicial adjuncts[.]”). Because Plaintiff's allegations concern Defendant's actions or inactions taken in his capacity as a judicial officer, Defendant is protected by quasi-judicial immunity and should be summarily dismissed from this action.

NOTICE CONCERNING AMENDMENT

Although Plaintiff has failed to allege sufficient facts to support a claim, he may be able to cure deficiencies in his complaint through amendment. *See Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc.*, 807 F.3d 619 (4th Cir. 2015). Plaintiff may file an amended complaint by **December 24, 2021**, along with any appropriate service documents. Plaintiff is reminded an amended complaint replaces the original complaint and should be complete in itself. *See Young v. City of Mount Ranier*, 238 F.3d 567, 572 (4th Cir. 2001) (“As a general rule, an amended pleading ordinarily supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). If Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the undersigned will conduct screening of the amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint or fails to cure the deficiencies identified above, the undersigned will recommend to the district judge that the claims be dismissed without leave for further amendment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 3, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge